DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 870 EA 013 933

AUTHOR Hord, Shirley M.
TITLE Distinguishing Between Cooperation and Collaboration: A Case Study Approach to Understanding Their Relative Requirements and Outcomes. Research on Concerns-Based Adoption.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 55p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Cooperation; *Cooperative Programs; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Models; *Research and Development Centers; Research Utilization; *School Districts

ABSTRACT

To gain insight into the nature of cooperative and collaborative processes and to contribute information to those considering similar research, an effort was initiated by a school district and a research center to work together in a "collaborative" mode. It was anticipated that the needs of the school district would be addressed, that the goals of the research center would be met, and that a descriptive model for collaboration would emerge. This paper presents a brief sampling of the literature on such joint efforts, a narrative of the context and events of the case study, an analysis and identification of the components and relationships required for both cooperation and collaboration, and descriptive models of cooperation and collaboration with predicted outcomes of each. Although the attempt at collaboration failed, it provided insight into the natures of collaboration and cooperation. Interinstitutional cooperation is a model wherein one institution is primarily involved in the task and the results fill that organization's needs. In contrast, collaboration involves both institutions in a shared task and provides mutually rewarding gains. Additional benefits also accrue in collaborative relationships. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

RESEARCH ON CONCERNS-BASED ADOPTION

R&DCTE

Research & Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

EA 013 933

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institue of Education should be inferred.

DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION: A CASE STUDY APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THEIR RELATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND OUTCOMES

Shirley M. Hord

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April, 1980

DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN COOPERATION AND COLLABORATION: A CASE STUDY APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING THEIR RELATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND OUTCOMES[1]

Shirley M. Hord

Research & Development Center for Teacher Education
The University of Texas at Austin

Why distinguish between cooperation and collaboration? Out of the experience of working together, the staffs of a national research center and a school district discovered differences in the two models. Explicating what must be put into the two ways of interrelating, and what the benefits may be, can aid in understanding the differences. Understanding then provides the basis for deciding at the outset what the relationship is intended to be. Thus, the design of such an undertaking is more explicit, resulting in outcomes that better match the expectations held by the individuals involved.

At the national, state, and local levels there are demands that educational research agencies develop means to better work with and serve their constituencies in the public schools. There is a parallel press for practitioners to use research outcomes. The problem follows: how can these goals be accomplished? How can diverse interest groups work together cooperatively or collaboratively?

---

[1]The research described herein was conducted under contract with the National Institute of Education. The opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

what, exactly, defines and distinguishes between a cooperative effort and a collaborative one? Are they, in fact, different? What requirements and outcomes may be expected from utilization of each?

There is some documentation available which describes how an agency and a component of a school district (e.g., a school or several classrooms) work together in a joint effort. For the most part, these reports make no attempt to distinguish between cooperation and collaboration -- the two processes are treated as if they were no different. Moreover, there is virtually no information available which describes how a research unit might work comprehensively across a large school district.

To gain insight into the cooperative and collaborative processes and to contribute to the meager information presently available to those who are considering similar research efforts, an effort was initiated by a school district and a research center to work together in a "collaborative" mode. It was anticipated that the needs of the school district would be addressed, the goals of the research center would be met, and that a descriptive model for collaboration would emerge. The effort was documented by an ethnographic, case study approach.

The report of that process is presented herein. Specifically, this paper undertakes to describe:

(1) a brief sampling of the literature and reports of persons who have worked togetner in similar joint efforts;

(2) a narrative of the context and events of the case study;

(3) an analysis and identification of the components and relationships required for botn cooperation and collaboration;

(4) descriptive models of cooperation and collaboration, with predicted outcomes of each.

The Literature

Before plotting a course across uncharted waters, it is useful to refer to the body of thought and experiences of others who may have passed that way before. Three areas of the literature were sampled:

(1) concepts and paradigms of organizational change and interorganizational behavior, to gain a global view of the scholarly perspective on groups working together;

(2) reports of agencies and institutions which "cooperated," "coordinated," "collaborated," or "consorted," in order to gain some understanding of the practitioner's point of view;

(3) similar reports of research units which have worked with public school people, to scrutinize this very sensitive relationship.

What the Scholars Propose

The work of behavioral scientists, social psychologists, management specialists and others has specifically addressed the theory and operation of organizations and interorganizational relationships. The content reported here by no means represents the totality of concepts and models in this field. Yet, in retrospect, even this cursory selection of material might have offered some constructive input for the organizations involved in the case study.

Basic to the study of organizations and their activities is the study of the individual of which the group is comprised. Moreover, individuals are

> joined together in groups, small and large, and they interact in these groups both as individuals and as groups ... an individual cannot exist in isolation, but only in relation to other individuals and groups (Miller & Rice, 1967, p. 14).

Thus, a theory of human behavior -- in addition to a theory of systems of activities -- is a requisite for a theory of organization. Miller and Rice further

suggest that "individuals and groups, however, have the capacity to mobilize themselves at different times into many different kinds of activity systems..." (p. 14). Therefore, it would seem that the discrete consideration of individuals within the relating organizations, with pertinent attention to each individual and his capacity to "mobilize" himself into action, is an important corollary to assessing a group's capability for movement.

In examining groups linked in mutual endeavor, Van de Ven (1976) defines an interorganizational relationship (IR) as having taken place

> when two or more organizations transact resources among each other. ...An IR is defined as a social action system on the premise that it exhibits the basic elements of any organized form of collective behavior.
>
> 1. Behavior among members is aimed at attaining collective and self-interest goals.
>
> 2. Interdependent processes emerge through division of tasks and functions among members.
>
> 3. An IR can act as a unit and has a unique identity separate from its members.

According to Van de Ven, this relationship can be studied

> in terms of structure (formalization, centralization and complexity), process (direction and intensity of resource and information flows) and ends (perceived effectiveness of the inter-agency relationships) (p. 28).

Similarly, organization theorists who have studied and analyzed interorganizational relationships and the internal behavior of the involved organizations found that those

> organizations with many joint programs tend to be more complex, more innovative, have more active internal communications channels, and somewhat more decentralized decision-making structures. No relationship was found between number of joint programs and degree of formalization (Aiken & Hage, 1968, p. 912).

These dimensions of structure (formalization, centralization, complexity) were included by Paulson (1974) in a critical study (of ten variables) and analysis of Hage and Aiken's work.

Schermerhorn (1975) notes the growing literature of interorganizational analysis and bemoans the lack of studies on cooperation. On the basis of a review of the literature, he suggests motivators which influence interorganizational cooperation:

> Organizations will seek out or be receptive to interorganizational cooperation when faced with situations of resource scarcity or performance distress... Organizations will seek out or be receptive to interorganizational cooperation when a powerful extra-organizational force demands this activity (p. 848).

Schermerhorn summarizes the potential costs to organizations for these cooperative relationships: loss of decision-making autonomy; unfavorable ramifications for organizational image or identity; or costs requiring the direct expenditure of scarce organizational resources.

Beckhard (1975) states that making organizational interventions will not result in change (to more cooperative or collaborative modes) that remains in operation unless the following conditions are attendant:

a. There must be real dissatisfaction with the status quo; a high enough level of dissatisfaction to mobilize energy toward some change.

b. There must be in the organizational leaders' "heads" some picture of a desired state which would be worth mobilizing appropriate energy.

c. There must be in the organization leaders' "heads" a knowledge and picture of some practical first steps toward this desired state, if energy is to be mobilized to start (p. 424).

In a special issue of The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, entitled "Collaboration in Work Settings," Eric Trist (1977) underscores the importance of collaboration:

> Since the present work has become interdependent on a scale

> hitherto unknown, this has the implication that collaboration, for the individual and organization alike, has acquired primacy over competition. The many uses which the latter still retains have become subordinate (p. 270).

In this same volume, collaboration is defined by Appley and Winder (1977) as a relational system in which:

1) individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework;

2) the interactions among individuals are characterized by "justice as fairness";

3) these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of his/her motives toward the other; by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a matter of choice (p. 281).

Organizations utilize "cooperative strategies" as a means for managing their interdependence with other organizations. Thompson (1967) concludes that these strategies involve various kinds of cooperation. The first is contracting, an informal consensus and more formal or negotiated agreements for the future exchange of performances. Another is coopting, "the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure" (p. 35) so as to increase its stability, a more constraining kind of cooperation than contracting. The third form of cooperation is coalescing, which is the engagement of two or more organizations in a joint venture to reach goals. It provides a basis for exchange and subsumes a commitment for future decisions made jointly, an even more constraining form of cooperation than coopting.

What the Practitioners Report

There is a burgeoning body of literature emanating from the field of education as institutions and agencies engage in working relationships in a variety of modes. These reports come in large measure from the experiences of institutions of higher education working with each other in a consortium for some

mutual objective; from the programs of universities or colleges working with public schools or other settings for preservice and inservice education, especially teacher training; from the activities of local, state and federal agencies relating with each other or other community agencies in some joint endeavor. It seems worthy of noting the substantial number of accounts in the literature from the domains of cooperative/career education and adult/vocational/community education -- there is much similarity and overlap in these areas. It appears that the nature of their ventures necessitates some form of interorganizational relationships for achieving their goals and training objectives. What have these groups who have been involved in some type of intergroup relationships reported?

Consortia of institutes of higher education. Patterson (1975) documents an increase in the number of consortia, noting a 1968 listing of 31 groups and 300 member institutions, which had increased to 106 groups, 1100 member institutions by 1975. These statistics refer to organizations voluntarily formed, staffed by a full-time professional director, with three or four member institutions, several programs, and tangible member support for the central organization.

In "How Five Colleges Cooperate," Burn (1973) reports receiving numerous requests for how to start a cooperative venture among institutions of higher education. It appears that the goals of these consortia are generally targeted toward the efficient and effective use of resources across institutions.

Burn cites some of the problems experienced by the Five College Consortium. Stresses stemmed from relinquishing institutional autonomy and the disjunction among the institutional academic calendars. Some of the costs noted were: time for planning and meetings; developing structures for meetings across institutions; meetings of deans, department chairpersons, secretaries, budget

directors; a bus system, transportation for students between the colleges as they attend courses offered on one campus open to all students in all the colleges. The benefits noted by Burn centered on expanded opportunities for students and faculty; the assistance to the four private and one public, four smaller and one larger college in student recruitment; the provision for hiring husband and wife teams across campuses; and the opportunity to fill joint faculty appointments with an eminent scholar, not likely affordable by one college alone.

How was the cooperative venture accomplished? Councils or interinstitutional representatives of departments met regularly once or twice a year to plan and discuss problems. A board of directors, composed of the presidents and/or chancellors of the colleges and the five-college coordinators met monthly to set policy and approve budgets. A group of deans/deputies from each college met twice a month with the coordinator. Communication was important and each institution was kept informed of what was happening at the others. The more specific steps of the process may be found elsewhere (Burn, 1973).

Partnerships of universities and colleges and public schools. In a report entitled "A Tale of Dichotomous Desires," Metzner (1970) posits that, in the past, university and school joint ventures have failed because of differing aims and objectives of education held by the two institutions. He describes the lack of agreement between education professors and elementary teachers and suggests possible solutions to consider for improving the prospects for joint endeavors. The principal is identified as the key individual in joint school-university relations. Therefore, selection of the principal should be on the basis of his/her understanding of the university's orientation. Furthermore, school faculty selection for the joint endeavor should be focused on change-oriented teachers who are identified by the following variables: 1) age -- young teachers are

more open to change, 2) experience -- less experienced teachers are more receptive, 3) inservice training -- those persons who've had more than the required amount of training show greater readiness for change, 4) masters degree -- teachers with this higher level of education tend to be more open to innovation, 5) grade level placement -- upper elementary grade teachers are more open, whereas resistance to new procedures increases as the grade assignment decreases. A third consideration is the continual involvement of the administration, school faculty, and university personnel in all stages of planning, evaluation and decision-making.

In a report on a joint school-university program, Schwartz (1973) notes that sharing decisions about staffing, budgeting and training program content was a new experience for both university and public school administrators. Yet, the collaborative nature of the program -- training teachers for urban schools -- required joint decision-making. The need for equal membership of university faculty and public school personnel on the policy-making committee is emphasized.

Howey and Cannon (1978) investigated the structure (number of persons from each institution) and process of collaboration in decision-making (how much each person talked, asked questions, made statements). Their conclusions reiterate the desirability of parity for each institution's representatives. Several factors contributed to process parity: group process training, experience by council members in collaborative decision-making, and an active role in meetings by the team manager.

An explicit how-to-do-it model for a cooperative university and school district effort has been developed by Hurwitz (1974). He presents three sets of guidelines, the first two addressed to the public school component. The third set describes strategies for staff development for members of both components.

This manual seems to be a useful document for those interested in developing a partnership focused on common goals between a university school of education and school district.

In a report from the New England Program in Teacher Education (1973), five years of activities between schools and colleges in teacher activities is described. This study specifically addressed the goal of collaboration among institutions and focuses on arrangements, activities, and projects which would develop the collaborative mode. One of the results of the study is evidence of existing collaboration. For example, planning, development and evaluation of activities is done jointly by teachers, principals, college professors, college administrators and student teachers. The collaborative process contrasts with the project's initial mode of operation which is described as cooperation. This contrast between cooperation and collaboration is indicated as follows:

> Cooperation -- two individuals or institutions reach some mutual agreement, but their work together does not progress beyond this level.
>
> Collaboration -- development of the mode of joint planning, joint implementation and joint evaluation between key individuals or institutions.

In a recent offering by Lanier (1979), this distinction between cooperation and collaboration is reinforced. Using the metaphor of the family, a mother cooperates with her son by allowing and encouraging his rock band to practice in their home. The daughter cooperates with the mother by preparing hors d'oeuvres for the mother's guests. These efforts are cooperative; the activities are mutually agreeable but not for mutual benefit.

The family collaborates in a family meal preparation; they each "offer some form of expertise that is rewarding to all... (which) contributes to the well-being of the whole group" (p. 408). Lanier's ideas provide a helpful starting

point in distinguishing cooperation and collaboration; they are expanded in the final section of this paper.

Projects of local, state, national agencies. Cooperation in community education and community schools is based on alliances of colleges and industry or business, representing a variety of styles of interagency cooperation. These liaisons are generally described as efforts to identify needs, locate resources and expertise, and then share, exchange, or barter for the common good. The sharing and delivery of these resources and the allocation of independent responsibilities is the typical focus of cooperation for community education. This sharing of resources is a prevalent theme in a number of reports (Parson, 1975; Weiss, 1975; Freidman, 1975; Ringers, 1976; Smith & Longnion, 1974). After the important tasks of communicating and defining roles have been accomplished, each agency moves in an independent fashion to execute its unique assignments (Parson, 1975; Van Voorhees, et. al, 1977).

In an article on community education, Eyster (1975) suggests that the term interagency collaboration indicates

> more intensive, long-term, and planned concerted efforts by community organizations than are usually implied by the terms interagency coordination or interagency cooperation (p. 24).

This "more" is heavily dependent on the energies, commitment and talents of one person who is a middleman or catalyst. Esterline (1976) defines the term coordination as the exchange of needed resources between two organizations. Levine and White (1961) reinforce this notion, explaining the relationship among community health and welfare agencies as involving an exchange system.

A variety of projects are investigating or supporting efforts for coordination or cooperation for various purposes: state-wide agencies and consortia of postsecondary education (Grupe & Murphy, 1974); agencies involved in health career education and training (Hood & Thompson, 1976); Title XX and social ser-

vices (Title XX & CETA, 1976; CETA & HEW, 1976), regional Teacher Corps projects (Mortensen, 1976); community recreational division's performing arts section and school administrators (Dwyer, 1974); and federal government agencies involved in Manpower programs (Cassell, 1976).

These reports are from practitioners of diverse professional orientations. Though not research-based, these sources contribute information on an operational level about cooperation and collaboration and about the differences between the two processes.

What the Researchers Share

There has been continuing and abundant discourse about interorganizational cooperation and interagency behaviors pursuant to a shared goal, literature which has excellent potential application for researchers and school people. There is, however, a paucity of sources which report on the special requirements necessary to support the sensitive relationships between researchers and research subjects working in a collaborative mode. Two reports from industry/university researchers seem applicable to the educational setting. Walker and Hampel (1974) suggest that one of the biggest deterrents to industry/university research relationships is that universities do not know the needs of industries and industry does not know the capabilities of universities:

> Themes which occurred and reoccurred ... was the need for more means of identification. How can industry look into the vast number of complicated universities and find out who knows what? How can universities look at the equally complex array of industries and find out where the needs are, who is interested in what I am investigating and who will then make use of the information I discover? (p. 27)

Such issues, it seems, also plague schools and educational researchers.

Rahn and Segner (1976) delineate key ingredients for increasing industrial and university interaction and research: "communications, mutual trust, in-

terest, effective commitment, lasting relations and person-to-person relationships" (p. 36). This is pertinent advice for those considering research interactions, whether in industry, business or the nation's schools.

Research "on" schools. The traditional model of research, development, dissemination, and (hopefully) adoption has been woefully lacking in meeting the needs of educators. Educational researchers have generally gone about the business of their work with singleminded effort. They identify a research need, develop a research design, persuade the school to permit them entry, beguile the subjects in the schools with esoteric descriptions of their sophisticated work, then depart when they have concluded "their" piece of research "on" the school. The practitioners in the schools may or may not ever be priviledged with access to the research findings. If they are, one might speculate about the relevancy of the results, and whether or not practitioners can interpret them in meaningful ways and incorporate them into teaching practice. It would be unfair and unrealistic to suggest that all educational research of this sort has been without value. There has been, however, sufficient negative commentary on this theme to stimulate efforts for new research methods which utilize input from practitioners at all phases of the effort, methods which are collaborative in nature. Barber (1977) asserts there is a clear and present need for research in schools as opposed to research on schools. This increasing need for in-school research suggests a change in focus for the research community from the traditional research on-the-school approach.

Research "in" schools. If researchers are to work "in" schools, this would presume a change in their behaviors toward sharing the research process. One prototype of how this might occur is that of the interactive model of Ward and Tikunoff at Far West Lab (1976). This model brings together the teacher, the researcher, the developer, and the teacher trainer. This consortium works

together identifying the research problem, planning the research design, gathering and analyzing, and reporting the data. The classroom teacher is a major participant in each step of the research process -- clearly, in-school research.

Chittenden (1978) also reports of collaborative research undertaken with teachers in classrooms. "Congruity between the teacher's agenda and that of the researcher" is a necessity; important also is "the fact that principal methods of the study (observation) were congruent with the teacher's ongoing concerns" (p. 9). Incorporation of the perspectives of both researcher and practitioner, at phases of planning, research, and data analysis, is being undertaken. Similarly, Florio and Walsh (1976) describe a blending of roles for classroom research in which both teacher and researcher work closely to pose researchable questions, formulate hypotheses, and gather and analyze data.

These models of classroom research appear to produce exciting results for those involved. The researcher-users of the models are enthusiastic in their appreciation for the teacher-researcher in their research role. Further, this kind of collaborative work facilitates the immediate application of findings on-site which enhance its problem-solving utility.

Research "with" schools. The apparent usefulness of the collaborative model described above raises an important issue: how can this kind of research be broadened so that it can impact more than the single, isolated classroom? How can the collaborative relationship be extended to many classrooms or to an entire school? A literature search was undertaken with this theme; it produced few results. There appears to be no cohesive body of knowledge useful for shaping the work between the research community and the public schools. Only two items from the literature appear to be relevant, both related to activities

ongoing at the University of Pittsburgh Learning Research and Development Center (LRDC).

McGrail and Brikel (1978) report on a relationship of the LRDC with an elementary school; they describe a number of components necessary for an effective relationship. This concise report, however, does not provide a description of the operationalization of the necessary components.

A second LRDC report (Vaughn, 1978), describes at length the long-term (12 year) relationship of the center with a school district and one of its schools. The school district agreed to work with the newly organized LRDC to develop products for conducting innovative instruction at a new school currently under construction (K-6 for 200 children). From the initial stage, researchers met with the school district administrative staff and worked with the elementary teachers for planning the proposed instructional program and to develop and implement the new curricula. The major focus of this comprehensive report is the operations of the LRDC in concert with the school district administration and the specific elementary school staff. This was a "particular type of collaboration between an R&D institution and a public school system," the aim of which was "model/curriculum development" (p. 203).

Two sets of recommendations were generated out of this experience. One set addresses collaboration for the purpose of developing educational models and/or instructional materials. Recommendations include developing a basis for interaction between the school system and the research institution, considering carefully the logistics and other contextual conditions under which the collaborative project will function, and making sure that the goals of the work to be done are clear to the school district.

The second set of recommendations focuses on collaborations of more general purpose. Suggestions include resolving potential contentious issues before be-

ginning a collaborative undertaking, reaching all decisions jointly, sharing responsibility for project outcomes between researcher and practitioners. Such practical suggestions addressed to researchers and school staff are useful as they operationalize collaboration in a single school setting.

The Vaughan documentation was "undertaken to fill an obvious vacuum...and to preserve what was learned about the processes of meshing research and practice" (p. 204). In a more recent paper, Houston (1979) repeats that

> the paucity of research on collaboration is astounding. The literature is filled with case studies and observations... (describing) conditions, designs, and dreams. Very few even attempt to analyze their operations (p. 333).

Houston cites the need for research which would address such complex aspects of collaboration as the structure of collaborative enterprises (organization, governance, management structure), problems of communication at all levels within and between institutions, and support and reward systems for the individuals involved in the group effort.

Houston offers hypotheses derived from the literature, from his own experience and from common "lore." Examples of these are that 1) collaborative relationships are more likely to grow from successful previous experiences, 2) goals which are clear and mutually held will aid collaboration, 3) achieving short-term goals will encourage a positive view and encourage progress, and 4) assumptions and decisions in a collaboration seem to come out of personal experience. Such hypotheses need testing. Clearly, there is a lack of research and a need for studies which would provide insight and shed light on this relationship.

This paper is presented in the spirit of Vaughan and Houston -- to share with others the experience and knowledge gained from the efforts of a research center and a public school system in working together, to shed light on the complicated processes of cooperation and collaboration. The remainder of this

paper focuses on the participants' experiences as they interacted in an effort to work together more effectively.

Context and Narrative Description

Beginnings tend to foreshadow much of what follows: things begun carry their own momentum (Lake & Callahan, 1971).

A description of the context of this experience and a narrative of events will help establish a perspective for understanding the cooperation/collaboration process which evolved. But first, it is appropriate to indicate the data source. An ethnographer was designated to follow the activities of all individuals and groups and to document events as they unfolded. This professional educator had prior working relationships and credibility in both the school district and the research center. This provided the ethnographer immediate access to persons in both organizations. The ethnographer observed meetings of large and small groups (formal and informal), received logs of telephone calls, and conducted one-to- one debriefing interviews. A high level of trust was developed. Individuals frequently initiated reports of activities and recounts of interactions among participants to the ethnographer, thus enriching the qualitative data being collected.

In the second year of data collection, it became clear that not only were many of the study participants reporting to the ethnographer for documentation, but also for therapeutic purposes. This was acknowledged by several persons who, at the conclusion of the documentation period, said to the ethnographer that they would miss the opportunity to visit and "unravel their heads."

The ethnographer's easy entry into the system made sensitive information immediately available. To obtain information previous to the ethnographer's

inclusion in the project (September, 1976), interviews with those involved in the project were conducted.

This case study is written by the ethnographer who traced the development of the Walnut Valley Public School District/Texas Research and Development Center project beginning in September, 1976. The strategy for data collection was to follow as broadly based as possible all actions and events which might provide input or influence the collaborative effort. Therefore, documenting current activities and processes and retrieving past history was deemed important. At the outset, a specific product from the ethnographic effort was not defined, though a case study description of the collaborative relationship and process between an R&D Center and a school system was a strong consideration.

Characters and Context

A brief description of the two organizations, their components and professional staff follow.

School district (WVPS). The major metropolitan school district has eighty schools, including nine high schools. It is located in an aestnetically appealing, recreationally attractive, academically stimulating environment -- a growing city. It is large, with low profile industrial and governmental businesses forming the tax base. The district has been involved with legal action relative to desegregation for a number of years.

Two influential departments of the district's central administration were active in the study. The Office of Evaluation, Research and Development (OERD) responds to the school board's annual priority concerns for the district by providing input and support. Further, all programs are subject to review by OERD and a great deal of information is collected in classrooms by its staff. This

office is responsible for all research efforts which occur in the district. Applications for such activities are quite numerous. The director of this component is a strong and nationally recognized leader in the area of school-based evaluation, and is trusted and supported by the Board of Education.

The Division of Instruction, also involved in the study, includes instructional coordinators who respond across the district to needs in various subject areas. In addition, federal compensatory program planning staff fall under this division. These federal planning persons are continually requesting information and more effective strategies for improving practice. The director of this division has been in the district many years as a building level and central office administrator and is nearing retirement age. He manages his division firmly; he, too, is well regarded by the board and "has their ear."

Research center (UTR&D). For many years prior to the center's 1965 inception and since that time, individuals in the center have maintained relatively close and continuous relationships with the district and various schools through a series of research, development and field testing initiatives. In 1973, as a result of funding agency priorities and policies, the center was reorganized around several relatively separate projects. While some institutional cohesion and resource sharing was maintained, the research mission of the various projects reduced inter-project communication and cooperation. Then, in 1976, a specific project was established to draw together the center research projects in a collaborative/cooperative effort with the district. There was strong support voiced for this by the National Institute of Education (NIE), by UTR&D and by the WVPS District. The project drew from each of the center's projects which furnish different methodology and expertise:

> Correlates of Effective Teaching (COET) contributes findings from systematic classroom research about behaviors of effective teachers.

Teaching-Learning Interaction (TLI) identifies teaching strategies that have optimal effect with students of different learning styles.

Evaluation of Teaching (EOT) engages in the development of prototype evaluation systems for the study of teacher training programs.

Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) focuses on the understanding and facilitation of change in schools.

Each of these programs was represented by their respective directors who were the principal center actors in the center/district relationship. The director of the center overall was the director of the WVPS/R&D project.

Narrative

A summary of the events of the two-year endeavor follows a brief report of earlier work between the UTR&D and WVPS District.

Early district/center relationships. The R&D Center, at its beginning, was cosponsored by the local university, by the district, and the state education agency. From its inception, the R&D Center was actively involved in research and development activities in the school district. The center's experimental teacher education program was conducted in the district's schools. Many of the center's research studies involving teachers and children have taken place in these schools. With the formalizing of the district's Office of Evaluation, Research and Development, several of the center's research projects worked closely with this division, adjusting research questions and designs so that the findings would be relevant and useful to the school system in addition to forwarding the center's research. There were ongoing working relationships between the district and the center.

Getting closer. In the fall of 1975, the R&D Center approached the WVPS District through OERD for the purpose of developing a closer relationship with the schools. Across the nation, school-based evaluators had complained to NIE

that research was done in schools by researchers who didn't know anything about schools. The R&D Center had a history of school-based research, so it was thought that perhaps something could be learned about successful researcher-practitioner relationships by studying the process.

In November of 1975, a meeting with WVPS administrators and R&D directors reviewed what the center had done in the past and discussed the potential for a shared venture: "It would be nice to work together. How would we work together? What would we do if we work together? What expertise can we each provide?"

From November to January, 1976, there were discussions with individual school district administrators, including the superintendent. The superintendent and directors were to survey the school administrative staff to assess needs. The district, however, could not articulate research needs. The staff had other concerns:

> Administrators (above the principal level) had problems that were not related to teaching or instruction. Rather, their concerns were with salaries, stipends, discipline, locating buildings, and public relations.
>
> Teachers seemed unable to articulate potential areas for research, though they could talk about problems, which could be transferred into research questions.
>
> The instructional coordinators were a good source for understanding classroom problems, though they were not primarily in the decision-making stream, and the amount of influence they could wield was limited.

In January, 1976, a written survey was submitted by OERD to twenty administrators for the purpose of identifying problem areas which might be addressed by

a classroom-based research study. Two or three responses resulted which were not precisely articulated or directly related to the request. Administrators seemed too concerned about other pressures to give it much attention.

Much energy was spent in this assessment effort. In the end, however, articulation of the needs did not come from administrators, but from OERD -- where knowledge of achievement patterns in the district suggested a possible area for investigation. Evaluation data from many studies in the schools were indicating that achievement gains for low SES children were not as high as desired. Concurrently, the unique research thrusts of the projects at the R&D Center reported new findings related to this problem. Key variables associated with increased achievement in the basic skills had been identified (Correlates of Effective Teaching and Teaching-Learning Interaction Studies Projects); new statistical conceptualizations and designs for evaluating achievement gains had been developed (Evaluation of Teaching Project); and the Concerns-Based Adoption Project had been developing ways for studying and documenting implementation and had been advancing hypotheses about how to personalize and more effectively implement planned change. It was reasoned that, in combination, these data bases, along with the skilled staffs of the WVPS and the R&D Center, had the potential for making a significant impact on the district's schools.

The center's project directors and staff from the district evaluation office (OERD) held a series of meetings over several months to explore and develop a plan for more extensive collaboration across projects within the center and between the center and the school system. The goal of these meetings was the development of a plan of action that would combine input from all of the center's projects with school evaluation data to impact achievement of low SES pupils.

Getting into gear, May-November, 1976: seven months. From May through November, 1976, center and OERD people met formally on thirteen occasions to discuss project possibilities and feasibilities. At each meeting, the set of questions posed were: how do we initiate action; who will initiate; where do we get started; is anything happening; who might do what/when; what is the degree of commitment and priority; what is happening to the contract; where is the money; what is the scope of work; what would be included? There seemed to be confusion regarding many issues in both organizations. Finally, negotiations for the project were completed with NIE.

It was projected that the collaboration would entail extensive analyses of the WVPS data base generated from all of their previous evaluation studies. The Evaluation of Teaching Project in the center would coordinate this effort. Concurrently, the center's Correlates of Effective Teaching Project, with assistance from the Teaching-Learning Interaction Studies Project, would review their research findings and the literature to identify meaningful instructional and teaching approaches that were judged to have promise for influencing the achievement of low SES pupils. These two efforts would result in the development of a set of proposed instructional approaches with a research base that the various schools and teachers in WVPS District could implement in the succeeding years. With implementation, the application of these approaches would provide a fertile ground for further research and evaluation.

The CBAM Project's contributions to this coordinated effort were to be three-fold. First, it would provide consultation about the planning and design of the collaborative thrust, to ensure that the effort would be accepted by the various constitutiencies involved. Secondly, the project would develop guidelines for implementing the teaching and instructional components once these were identified. And, thirdly, CBAM Project would document, using a case study meth-

odology, the further development of this unique collaborative effort between a national R&D Center and a school system.

Questions for the "low SES achievement" study were specified, and the research design was refined through interaction of the center and the district's staff. The district's Board reviewed the design and approved it.

Meanwhile, in response to a suit filed six years previously, a plan for desegregation of WVPS schools was called for by the federal courts. That plan was to be formulated by the Board concurrently with the filing of an appeal by the Board to the U.S. Supreme Court to hear the case. It was felt by center and district project participants that the possible desegregation activities might positively influence the implementation of promising research findings, which would aid in improving the low achievement scores.

December, 1976-February, 1977: three months. On December 7, 1976, district and center people met to review progress. Two literature searches on teaching strategies related to low SES pupil achievement were completed by CDET, though project staff were not satisfied with the quality; supplemental searches out of CDET's work would therefore be done. The district reported that the very recent court ruling on desegregation had not diminished the task -- it was critical to keep moving ahead. The center reported that the NIE contract came with no signature and was rejected and sent back for signature. It was also reported that all Washington bureaucrats were standing around quaking and shaking in their boots (presidential transition period) -- nothing was happening.

This December 7th meeting focused, as did subsequent ones on January 10, 13, and 14, and February 10 and 28, on how to translate the research findings into practice for impact on the district. Suggested alternatives were to gain entry through limited individual contacts, staff development, teacher evaluation, Title I, instructional coordinators, brochures, principals, area adminis-

trators, and/or Division of Instruction. The questions were: who should do it, how to do it, and when to do it? A second topic of these meetings was the issue of the center's making a choice of a future role for working with the district. Wide ranging discussion centered on possible center roles. OERD district people suggested teacher evaluation as a potential area for the center to be involved with the district. The center posture on this notion was reluctance to be associated with such a sensitive area as teacher evaluation.

Seldom were minutes taken for the meetings and, during this time period, the same topics were recycled -- how to gain entry; what role did the R&D Center wish to have in the future? Perhaps it was thought that the documentor would be relied upon for a minutes-taking task, though there was no clarity in this regard. Some participants had assumed that the ethnographer was keeping the various parties informed of each other's actions; the ethnographer assumed the role was to be a documentor, with no additional involvement. It is clear that, at this point, the role had not been thoroughly spelled out.

March-May, 1977: three months. After months of continual questing for entry into the district in order to introduce the results of the work already underway, a meeting was held in March with COET and the district's Division of Instruction. The result of this meeting was a two-page summary of the division's perceptions of the district's needs for research and development. COET promised to react with what could be done to accommodate the needs, and to provide a time line.

At the end of May, 1977, an agreement was reached by COET and the Division of Instruction to address the problems of classroom management. Information would be gathered in classrooms at the first of the school year, and at continuing points, to discover what variables contribute to how effective teachers set

up their rooms at the outset of the year. Information would also be collected on the strategies which teachers continue to utilize throughout the year.

The original focus of the district/center working relationship was initiated with OERD on the special problems in low SES pupil education, which was a district priority. COET's previous work on this problem had focused on a plan to employ selected principles of classroom management from the research findings being generated out of the literature and apply them to a treatment group accompanied by a research design to study the effects. However, it seemed that the hard data were not available. As a result, attention now was refocused on "the start of the year," a careful study, which would be examined for successful teacher behaviors. These behaviors would comprise a report or some vehicle which would be recycled through the Division of Instruction. Thus, explorations to gain entry for the application of literature review findings were shelved by COET. Direction changed; a focused observational study of classroom organization and management by COET with the Division of Instruction in WVPS District was now scheduled to occur. Meanwhile, OERD continued to distribute summaries of the literature reviews and continued to work on low SES pupil achievement by doing analyses of test data of minority students in a longitudinal design. Such ongoing work was achieved through the district/center project funds which were made available directly to OERD for reorganizing its data bases, for developing a reliable and feasible system of identifying ethnicity/SES status of individual pupils, and for producing a number of reports based on existing district data which they also distributed.

June-August, 1977: three months. In June, as the design (sample, methodology, questions, etc.) for the observation study was being generated, an NIE site review of the project was announced. Reflecting on the year, some OERD

staff saw themselves as communicating most frequently with COET about the project. At this time, however, they were also eyeing EOT as possibly able to help with teacher evaluation -- an upcoming task they saw as very big and very important.

During June and July, in large and small meetings, teacher evaluation was a topic strongly promoted by OERD as one about which the district needed help; teacher evaluation was a high priority for OERD. Discussions between OERD and center staff were focused on attempts by R&D to accommodate these needs. In July, at the NIE site visit meeting, approval was given for the involvement of EOT, through technical assistance, for the development of the district's teacher evaluation system. In summary, there was to be a double focus of R&D effort with WVPS District.

During July and August, COET continued to design the research, develop measures, and prepare for the classroom study, so that on the last day of August researchers were in the schools. Simultaneously COET was disseminating the reports prepared from the literature reviews to various district staffs (and to interested parties on the university campus). The effort by the project to impact the system broadly had been abandoned; to infiltrate the system, to the degree possible, was now the way to go.

Communication. During this same period, some communication strategies were identified. In an effort to be informed, the NIE monitor asked the documentor to regularly report on what was happening in the project. Thus, a very brief summary of events and situations was provided every few months. Two program directors in the center described a critical need for the center director (who was also the WVPS/R&D project director) to be kept informed of activities across the center as the various center staffs worked with each other and components of

the district. Thus, the documentor was asked to provide an update every two weeks.

In October, a COET person was designated to report periodically to both OERD and the Division of Instruction; a second COET person was identified to serve as an internal communicator within the center. The identification of various persons to serve in communication roles came as a result of need perceived by various participants and the project director. A similar perceived need, in November, resulted in a formal request to the documentor to serve as a communicator between the center overall and OERD, to make information exchanges more frequent. An informal communications link between an OERD individual dating a center person also provided a more casual exchange of information during this period.

Tooling up for #2, teacher evaluation, September-December, 1977: three months. In September, in the R&D Center, a common observation from EOT was "we're working our tails off" in the teacher evaluation study. Because of the tight time frame, activity in relation to the teacher evaluation development was quite intense. A couple of EOT people spent an entire night completing the preparatory task in order to have things ready in OERD's time line. On the other hand, OERD was more accustomed to working under short time contraints. It was not unusual for the staff to work around the clock at critical times, so they did not view their demands on EOT as unreasonable. Because of these differences in typical work style, OERD staff concluded that the R&D Center didn't nave time, resources, or interest in the teacher education project; nowever, they valued the contribution that EOT did make. The design for delivery to teachers and the mechanisms for obtaining and organizing feedback was viewed by OERD as a most useful joint endeavor with EOT, providing results much richer than would have occurred had OERD worked alone.

In early December, after the first phase (instrument construction) was completed, OERD and EOT outlined tasks and time lines for the next phases of teacher evaluation. Ideas were exchanged; resources for doing the work were discussed. EOT stated they had limited resources but were highly interested. No concrete plans were formulated.

What is collaboration? November-December, 1977: two months. In summary, COET was pursuing the classroom organization study, supported by the major project resources and approved by NIE. The results of this work were to be disseminated to low SES schools. Simultaneously, EOT had become involved with OERD in the teacher evaluation study; the effort had also received NIE approval. However, there were limited funds for both of the endeavors, resulting in growing stress.

To exacerbate this situation, OERD was responsible for all data collection and studies in schools. In a November meeting, OERD explained that teaching and administrative staffs in schools were concerned about all the data collection activities going on in schools. Data collectors were running into each other; data collection had to be better controlled so as not to be disruptive. The inference was that COET was collecting a great deal of data which must be monitored by OERD. It appeared that OERD was now beginning to become aware of the extent of the data collection.

An additional message from OERD was that the low SES pupil achievement problem, the original focus of project, was no longer viable as a collaborative vehicle, though the district continued its work in this area. OERD encouraged teacher evaluation as the focus for collaboration. This prompted the comment, made by OERD, that there had been no attempt to define collaboration very early

on -- there were different perceptions of what it meant to different groups. There followed a discussion of collaboration and cooperation[2] after which the meeting ended with no closure except for the suggestion to go along doing what was currently being done by the various members.

Through December, the two groups working on classroom organization and teacher evaluation exchanged views in small and large group meetings. The focus was collaboration, what it meant, how to do it, which project could more reasonably facilitate such a working relationship, whether both projects could continue with support and increased funding from NIE.

Two efforts continue, January-May, 1978: five months. The evaluation of teachers was a politically sensitive subject. In January, after the evaluation plan was accepted by the Board, it was thought advisable by OERD to let the dust settle. No OERD research operations with respect to teacher evaluation would take place until fall. There was currently no need or concern for resources, no need for support from EOT until the next year.

In February, in a series of meetings, EOT and OERD were charged to prepare a proposal which would present an outline, sketch out the past, report on current discussions, and prioritize a range of possibilities for the WVPS/EOT collaboration. The project director was encouraging this group to reach consensus. Concurrently, meetings of COET with the WVPS Division of Instruction resulted in the go ahead by the school district for COET to make plans to replicate the classroom study in junior high school math and English classes the next fall.

---

[2]The content of this conversation will be described in the Synthesis section of this paper.

In late April, an informal review of activities requested by the NIE monitor prompted the two groups to meet again, separately with the reviewer. The EOT/OERD group reported that they'd given much time and effort in planning and that their proposal was coming together. The NIE meeting with COET and the WVPS Division of Instruction staff provided the opportunity to discuss the possibility of EOT's using COET data collectors for the teacher evaluation research. This notion was an effort to conserve funds.

In May, OERD decided that the sensitivity of teacher evaluation and the need to procure permission from 2500 teachers made it difficult and "unethical" for an outside agency (EOT) to do a broad-scale reliability and validity study which EOT had in mind. Therefore, EOT would do a reduced part of what had previously been planned -- a major change in the sample size. EOT was not interested in the data which had been obtained already. It did not follow their research interests. It seemed that OERD would now consider EOT's work as a supplement to WVPS work rather than a major thrust.

At this time, OERD reported that "true collaboration" was just not possible. "A cooperative project with the R&D Center that takes into account OERD and district interest will happen when needs and time schedules permit working together." Because collaborative research together was not feasible, no structured collaborative work with the center was scheduled.

Synthesis: What Was Learned About Cooperating and Collaborating

... high horse pronouncements come trotting forth on wobbly legs (Kilpatrick, 1978).

Change in attitudes, behaviors, or relationships do not occur solely as a result of wishful thinking, stated desires or enthusiastic announcements. The volumes of documentation have been reviewed, the experiences of these two insti-

tutions have been reflected upon, and data have been sifted. Attention may now be focused on what was learned about working together. This report is in two parts: 1) findings which reinforce what is currently known about institutional attempts to work together, and 2) findings which contribute to what is not so well understood, that is, distinguishing interinstitutional cooperation from interinstitutional collaboration. This section then concludes with the presentation of models and examples which distinguish cooperation and collaboration.

Rediscovering What is Known

From reports in the literature, accumulated folk wisdom and common knowledge, a great deal is known about what is needed if organizations are to work effectively together. The experiences of the participants in this project validated the importance of several considerations.

Gaining entry. A great deal of project time, energy and attention was directed to the problem of entry. The concern was for how the center would not intrude but could "get with" district staff in order to broaden the base of interinstitutional relationships. Individuals learned that the development of personal ties which precede entry are an absolute necessity. The director of OERD had a long established professional relationship with directors in the center. It was the OERD director who initiated district interest and activity to join with the center.

These personal ties provided a toe-hold, so that center individuals could be brokered in by a trusted source. This person was an entree and paved the way for others into the system. The OERD director, who was highly regarded by the superintendent and Board of Trustees, was influential in gaining the district's acceptance and support of the joint work to be done. At another entry point,

the "take a product, what do you need that we can do" approach was very effective, indicating a willingness to share capability and an openness to needs. This posture gained the Division of Instruction director's appreciation and opened the door to interactive work. It should be noted that the broker tactic was also employed with this division to effect admittance.

Entry must be nurtured and maintained and this was done through continuing informal incidents, personalized contacts with one or two center people and one or two district people present. Small breakfast interactions were a favorite with the Instruction Division director. Center people used this format as a time and place for ongoing interaction.

Maintaining communication. In the second year of working together it became evident to many individuals in the center that the information flow and exchange must be strengthened, both internally and externally, horizontally and vertically, intrainstitutionally across the programs in the center and interinstitutionally with the district. As has been reported, one of the center programs identified a person to communicate with other programs within the center and a person to report to the directors of OERD and the Division of Instruction in the district. The ethnographer for the ongoing study was requested by the center director to serve as a communicator across the center with the center program directors and between the center and the district OERD director. These arrangements were made as a result of escalating complaints -- the "right-hand not knowing what the left-hand was doing."

How calendars contribute to misfit. The district was accustomed to the identification of annual priorities established by the board, to which district interests and resources would respond in a focused way during that year. This meant that district plans were related to activities whose duration could be expected to be one year. At the end of the year, reports were written and the

topic closed. Whether a priority would continue to be a focus for action after one year was uncertain. This was in contrast to the norms of the center where proposals for research activity are generated by project staff to cover an extended period of time (2-5 years), with analysis and reporting considered in the calendar.

An additional "calendar clash" was the the difference in the two organization's normal lead time for establishing appointments. Center staff set up engagements and filled appointment slots six to eight weeks in advance, whereas the district arranged appointments on twenty-four hours notice. Both organizations came to acknowlege this difference, laugh about it, and endeavored to compensate through mutual awareness of the problem.

Differing views. One of the strengths credited to the collaborative process is the variety of backgrounds, expertise, and perspectives contributed by various group members. Whereas this variance contributes to the richness of the resources, it can also contribute to divergence of purpose or goals in a number of aspects:

1. Varying agendas

Individuals involved in the project came in with an array of professional agendas. One person needed money to support research believed important. Anotner, who was a leader and officer of a national professional organization, was looking for a dynamic project worthy of national attention. A third participant was interested in testing research measures and in establishing a base from which to negotiate for other research projects. Only one person was focused on model building, ostensibly the overarching purpose of the project.

2. Perceptions of individual's actions

That the behaviors of one individual can be interpreted by others in

in a variety of ways was abundantly demonstrated. As an example, the same set of comments and actions were variously translated by different persons:

a. "He's unreasonable about his definition, he wants free labor for what he wants done."

b. "He's right on but nobody listened to him."

c. "He's turned around 180 degrees from three months ago, standing on his nead."

d. "He's an elitist and tninks nobody can do such a grandly visionary job."

3. Expectations for leadership

It was assumed that a new model for collaborative inquiry into public school problems would emanate as the staffs of the school district and research center worked together on a problem to be identified. The leader apparently assumed that this would best result from a style of leadership which required staying out of the participants' way while they went about the task. This view of leadership was not acceptable to those who felt that "things are floating," and should be more directly managed. The topic of appropriate or acceptable leadership was not addressed by the group, which resulted in a good deal of frustration for some individuals.

Distinguishing Cooperation and Collaboration

Well into the working experience, concern in both institutions over how time, efforts, and resources were being deployed stimulated an examination of what collaboration entails and what discrepancies there were in individual and institutional perceptions about it. Exchanges of letters, discussions in meetings and sharing with the ethnographer provided opportunities for clarifying

and conceptualizing the distinction between tne two mbdes of operation.

Views on Collaboration

It was acknowledged that there were different perceptions of what it means to collaborate. One person stated that OERD had provided access to school people and entry into the sytem; R&D provided WVPS with a subcontract so that they made decisions and spent money -- "in short, work as a full partner." Another person suggested that EOT was collaborating with OERD by offering technical assistance on the teacher evaluation system which the district wished to be developed. A third person observed that there had been true collaboration with EOT and OERD but that this had been a very chancy phenomenon and a real fluke; it had happened because one of the principals was in it for what could be gained and was "basking in the glory" of being in a new position of attention.

"When two sets of people who are cooperating get along well enough in sharing tasks, they move along a continuum into collaboration; there is no distinct difference," another person stated. He further suggested that collaboration is an extreme form of cooperation. Another individual stated that collaboration demands some give and take; it must be mutual.

Models of Cooperation and Collaboration

Synthesizing the perceptions about the researchers-school district relationship resulted in the development of two models (see Figure 1).

Project participants shared, "Obviously, we are doing two different things." They acknowledged that two models had been demonstrated in the two different tnrusts of center-district activity, that explicating the two models was tne most valuable outcome of the study, and that the two resultant models were "dead center on target," in terms of the processes involved.

Figure 1
Research Unit and School System Relationships

Model A	Model B
COOPERATION	COLLABORATION
Research on or for Schools	Research with Schools
Steps in the Process	
1. Researchers enter the school system as experts to study a problem.	1. Researchers enter school system and offer their expertise.
2. Researchers do a study related to needs identification.	2. Researchers and school system join forces to plan and to execute project.
3. Researchers report back on what they find; a product results.	3. Researchers and school system jointly design the study.
	4. Researchers and school system jointly collect and analyze data.
Communication	
. Researchers keep school system informed at intervals.	. Researchers and school system constantly interact across institutions at all levels.
Resources/Ownership	
. Researchers provide expertise and resources.	. Researchers and school system pool resources and capabilities.
. School system provides setting, sample, problem.	. Mutual funding is obtained.
. "Us/them" process mode develops (individual proprietorship).	. "We" process mode develops (system ownership).
Requirements/Characteristics	
. A problem area is identified.	. Time and energy is expended.
. Permission is obtained to work on the problem.	. Action and risk-taking people are involved.
	. Meetings (large and small) are necessary.
	. Compromise is necessary.
	. Fusion of combined staffs develops.
	. Contributions of different kinds of expertise takes place.
. Unilateral leadership is characteristic.	. Dispersed leadership is characteristic.
. Central control is characteristic.	. Shared mutual control is characteristic.
	. Shared goal(s) are characteristic.

In Model B, Collaboration, more time is required in meetings, but the outcomes are greater; Model B requires fusion or combining of staffs, each contributing different kinds of expertise so that the staff becomes joint. The example here was that of EOT and OERD--that their collaboration had become a happy marriage, with different but equal outcomes for both partners, with the quality of the product so much higher with mutual input. In contrast, COET's work with the district Division of Instruction at the planning level was collaborative, but at the operational level there was no combination of staffs (Model A, Cooperation).

In a totally collaborative model, there needs to be communication at all levels of the organizational hierarchy. It is critical to have multiple kinds of liaisons. This means that it is essential in a collaboration to have, in addition to large group meetings, one-on-one informal and fairly direct contacts. Communication has to be geared to meet individual needs and to resolve personal concerns.

Ongoing work (both individual and group tasks) and the outcomes of that work must be mutually satisfying. For example, the data should be designed to serve the interests of both researchers and school practitioners. EOT's elaborate sampling design for the teacher evaluation study provided a richer base of data, more informative to OERD, than would have existed if the district had worked alone. Likewise, EOT could do research on field-based evaluation systems, an important opportunity for them.

On the other hand, COET addressed district questions and the needs of its practitioners for study. Though the district was not a co-researcher with COET, COET consulted with the district about questions they wanted answered. It was suggested that COET had developed a cooperative effort with the district and that EOT had evolved a collaborative one. A participant's concluding note was

that collaboration was a "more completely effective co- partnership than had ever before happened."

Conclusions and Implications

The participants shared their views with the ethnographer and engaged in distinguishing cooperation and collaboration. Conclusions and implications about the two models follow.

Conclusions

Interinstitutional cooperating can be viewed as a model wherein one institution is primarily involved in the task; the second institution has helped to identify the problem or given sanction for so doing. Cooperating has been characterized as "allowing" and "encouraging." "Cooperative efforts ... are things we do for each other's individual well being" (Lanier, 1979, p. 407). This definition fits very well with the school district/research center's concept of cooperation and its outcomes. That is, results fill either the researcher's needs, such as provision of a field site for doing their own research, or the school system's need, such as obtaining data or data processing capabilities. In contrast, the products of collaboration are jointly owned and meet the needs of both institutions. There is an understood shared task objective; there is leadership toward it. The promise of mutually rewarding gains provides a powerful incentive for the collaborative process. Whether these shared outcomes are the "chicken or the egg" of collaborating remains an enigma -- the point is, collaboration "achieve(s) a common end" (Lanier, 1979, p. 408).

Additional benefits accrue as a result of the collaborative relationship.

Study participants cited an increased appreciation of other's capabilities and expertise. Being involved, not only in planning but in the operationalization of the work, individuals became aware of and valued what their colleagues in the research center or school district were able to do. There was increased awareness and understanding of the problems which were encountered and had to be overcome in order to get things accomplished.

The shared activities and experiences, in essence, add up to the development of "closer relationships." This is an effective outcome which grows out of task-focused interaction between persons who exchange respect and appreciation.

Implications

"I'm not sure that collaboration is possible. If our interests follow each other then perhaps in an informal way we can work on things together but in a formalized kind of way we may not be able to do this." This comment from one of the study participants may mean that cooperating may be possible when collaborating is not. "A cooperative project with R&D that takes into account district interest can happen easily; collaborative research together is not a possibility unless needs and time schedules permit. Then we will work together," the participant continued. Another school system participant reflected, "We don't have time to collaborate. We're more into your provision of resources and your sharing them with us. We have found that to be a very effective and productive way to work and so we're more into the cooperative mode." A further example of decreasing interest in collaboration is indicated by the comment, "The R&D Center does very good research and there may be more value to letting them do research and then give it back to us without involving us in all the planning, in all the energy, all the time, and so forth."

In summary, cooperation is an effective model; the products are viewed as substantial and valuable. The process, however, and perhaps the outcomes, differ in some respects from that of collaboration.

The degree of contribution from each organization is greater in collaboration:

1. Needs and interests -- The extent to which both organizations share needs and interests can determine their propensity to work together. As they identify similar symptoms and share the same pains, they can be drawn to solution sharing. Needs demand changes. Thus, the need is there and does not have to be created. There must be a sense of gain for each in joining together; when the gain is mutual, collaboration is more likely to occur.

2. Time -- Participants in the study assessed the collaborative relationship as too time consuming and, therefore, unworkable. Certainly, the work life of school practitioners is tightly jammed and finding time to collaborate in such an enterprise is probably very difficult. The lesson here is that a <u>much</u> greater amount of time is required for collaboration than cooperation.

3. Energy -- Involvement of persons in all aspects of the collaborative venture requires a great deal of effort on the part of all. Reaching-out people, action-taking individuals who will expend a great deal of energy are needed to sustain the collaborative spirit.

4. Communication -- Large and small meetings and interactions are an <u>on-going</u> requirement of collaborating institutions. The interactions must occur at all levels across both institutions. Cooperating may be sustained by regular but infrequent reporting. The collaborating mode is a sharing one and sharing is grounded in continuing and frequent communication.

5. Resources -- Obviously, an effort which requires more in terms of staff time and energy will be a more expensive operation. Supporting such an endeavor

requires more resources. Collaborating institutions share resources, not only committing funds and staff, but other forms of support as well. Each contributes and the "tab" is higher in terms of paying the expenses.

6. Organizational factors -- Collaborating means making connections with people. To the extent that each institution has an internal cohesion and a sense of unity, interinstitutional interactions can be facilitated. An organization which pulls together is more ready to team with other organizations. However, even in an overall cohesive organization, there may be obstructive individuals. One of the impeding factors cited by a participant in this study was that "tnere had been structures in the organization which did not make it possible for collaboration to happen. A critical person had been a bottleneck and was not able to be collaborated with." Certainly collaborating individuals within organizations encourage or promote collaboration between institutions.

7. Perceptions -- Taking the pulse or checking the perceptions of others by key persons in botn organizations contributes to the collaborating climate. The willingness to stand in another's boots and view the world from someone else's position contributes to give and take.

8. Fusion -- As organizations increase in their ability to assimilate input from each other and reach mutually agreeable compromise, so do they move toward collaborating capability. As individuals give up or modify unilateral goals for the "good" of group goals or objectives, the two staffs develop a fused status -- one group.

9. Control -- When participants increase in their willingness to relinquish personal control and incur more risk, then the environment becomes more open and flexible and the relationship of the two institutions can move more to collaboration. Collaboration is aided by a tolerance for ambiguity, another form of the absence of control. For persons who require that everything be

specified and stable, engaging in collaboration is very difficult. The cooperating model might be a better match between these people and the process.

10. Personal traits -- "If there is any special personality characteristic needed to function through this (collaborating) approach, it is probably simply patience" (Murray & Smith, 1974, p. 14). To that, should be added persistence.

What Did/Didn't Happen: A Few Questions

A year and a half later, after the completion of the study and documentation of the district/center effort, what were the outcomes? COET has provided literature reviews with accompanying short synopses to the district for distribution on individual request and to groups for inservice purposes. These are well received and valued by those district persons (coordinators, some principals and teachers) who have learned of their availability and procured them for some specific purpose. In addition, a classroom management study (in grade 3 classrooms) by COET was concluded; a replication of the management study in the junior high school by COET was also concluded. These studies are two of a programmatic series for COET; cooperation continues and is valued by both parties.

No other footprints are left in the dust by the work of either institution. Similarly, it is difficult to detect any impact of the effort on any of the participating individuals. The CBAM person charged with developing implementation strategies drifted out of the action in midstream of the project. This individual had continually predicted that the "collaboration" wasn't going to work and, therefore, he wasn't going to devote a lot of time to it. He did, however, spend a great deal of time in large and small group meetings, pursuing implementation strategies and providing counsel to the district's staffs. He typically directed his energies to his project's pursuits, as he still does.

It remains a question whether his lack of involvement contributed to a self-fulfilling prophecy.

The EUT people contributed to the teacher evaluation system but were denied a major study of the system and its processes. They subsequently did a minimal study with a reduced sample of volunteer teachers. Data were collected and analyses are still in process; at this time no product is available.

Prior to this project, the COET staff were in the schools doing their classroom research for which they designed, collected, and analyzed data. During the project (and to the present) the COET staff are in the schools doing their classroom research for which they design, collect and analyze data.

OERD responds still to the school board's annual priorities. They collect data and write year-end reports each June. However, one influence on OERD from the experience is that they do not now close out annually the focus of their activity. Low SES pupil achievement still is a focus of attention; teacher evaluation continues to be studied. Having given up on their explorations for a visionary type of school district/research center "collaboration" and having rung the death knell for any further attempts, they are uninvolved in any collaborative efforts and seek none. They continue in what has been labeled "cooperation," their previous relationship with the center.

Similarly, the Division of Instruction, which probably never heard of collaboration during the project period, provides sanction and opportunity for the center's "cooperative" research relationship.

What has changed? Next to nothing. Clearly, the project did not achieve institutionally the results or meet the objectives that were espoused by the three proponents (NIE, R&D, WVPS) at the outset. What started as a grand new effort for institutional collaboration converged into the traditional model of cooperation. Certainly the effort was not a complete loss, but, clearly, it

never evolved into the collaborative model it was intended and proclaimed to be. It reverted back to the cooperative, permission-giving mode: the center came in, did its thing, shared its results.

It is not the intent of this writer in any way to denigrate or to deny the considerable outcomes of the working relationships described in this paper. The actors contributed cooperatively to the various ventures described. It should be made abundantly clear that utilizing the cooperation model can result in high levels of productivity; cooperation is valued. There is no intention to "represent collaboration as a supreme virtue, an end in itself, which these poor mortals failed to achieve through self-interest, low energy, resistance, or other human weaknesses" (participant's comment).

It should be noted that the school district and research center paused in their work with each other to confront, briefly, the issue of collaboration/ cooperation and to make some statements about it. They made an effort to sort out the differences between the two processes, whereas initially the terms collaboration and cooperation were used interchangeably. This reflection provided some insights into each model. The questions can now be asked: why did the two institutions back off from collaboration and revert to the traditional roles? Why did they not continue to pursue the collaborative vision?

At the outset, did participants know the requirements of collaboration? The two institutions appeared to understand some of the roles and behaviors and responsibilities for a collaboration by the end of the effort. Was the failure to collaborate because participants wanted only to give lip service to that objective, maintain the faith without costs? Were the costs too high? Did participants know the costs at the outset?

Was it because of a lack of a common goal? The purpose of the project was not really made clear. A lack of consensus and the lack of a compelling central

focus permitted two competing research thrusts to develop. What was envisioned as a broad institutional collaboration gradually coalesced into subsystem specific foci. Several of the individuals were operating with their own personal agendas.

Was it because of a lack of strong leadership? At the start, leadership was kept low-key. Such a style was expected to permit participating members to initiate mutual endeavors on their own. The low-key style was accompanied by a lack of pressure on individuals to shift behaviors in order to facilitate collaboration. In hindsight, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that, in the collaborative model, there must be strong or catalyzing, albeit dispersed, leadership.

Was it because of a lack of planning? Decision-making which would have preceded and provided the basis for planning didn't take place in the large meetings. Instead, decisions were made in between meetings as individuals figured out where they stood. Because no decisions were made in the larger context, planning was disjointed and lacked direction and comprehensiveness.

Was it because of a lack of initiative? The project's negotiation process was vague, with perceptions not clarified and semantics not defined. Perception checks were made in small dyads and triads to certify what was said or meant in the larger meetings. Thus, individuals may have been afraid to risk initiative under such ambiguous conditions or perhaps they saw no value in so doing.

In conclusion, documentation of this aborted effort at collaboration makes an important contribution. That contribution is a clearer distinction between cooperation and collaboration. A great deal of further inquiry, elaboration, and refinement begs to be done. From this experience, perhaps others who are considering interinstitutional endeavors may assess at the outset the requirements and appropriateness of the two models, with a fuller understanding of

the costs and benefits of each. As one participant stated, "I think the effort made most of us far more informed, aware, and possibly intelligent about the array of factors to be understood and taken into account in the most effective kinds of cooperation. Maybe that ain't the ultimate, but it's progress."

References

Aiken, M. & Hage, J. Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. American Sociological Review, 1968, 33(6), 912-930.

Appley, D. E. & Winder, A. E. An evolving definition of collaboration and some implications for the world of work. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977, 13(3), 279-290.

Barber, L. W. The need for research in schools. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1977 (ERIC ED 138 565).

Beckhard, R. Organization development in large systems, In K. D. Benne, L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb, and R. O. Lippitt (Eds.), The laboratory method of changing and learning. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1975.

Burn, N. How five colleges cooperate. Liberal Education, 1973, 59(3), 298-310.

Cassell, F. H., et. al. Intergovernmental linkage and cooperation: Models for strengthening state and local management of manpower programs. Contract No. 17-6002-72. Washington, DC: Employment and Training Administration (DOL), 1976 (ERIC ED 138 729).

CETA and HEW Programs. Report for Office of Human Development (DHEW), Office of Manpower. San Francisco, CA: Urban Management Consultants of San Francisco, Inc., 1976 (ERIC ED 133 502).

Chittenden, E. A. The development of collaborative relationships between researchers and teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Dwyer, K. Interagency cooperation -- The more the better. Parks and Recreation, 1974, 9(6), 59-60.

Esterline, B. H. Coordination: A conceptual model and practical consideration. Paper presented at the Education Commission of the States' National Seminar on State Capacity Building, December, 1976 (ERIC ED 140 460).

Eyster, G. W. Interagency collaboration ... The keystone to community education. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(5), 24-26, 33.

Florio, S. & Walsh, M. The teacher as colleague in classroom research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1976.

Friedman, A. Inter-relationships: An idea whose time has arrived. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(5), 11-13.

Grupe, F. H. & Murphy, A. Survey of statewide agency/consortia relationship. Report for the Education Commission of the States. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, Higher Education Services, 1974 (ERIC ED 092 032).

Hood, T. W. & Thompson, C. W. An operational blueprint for health career education and training program. Final Report. Grant No. DEG-0-74-1652. Washington, DC: District of Columbia Public Schools, 1976 (ERIC ED 136 020).

Houston, W. R. Collaboration - See 'treason,' In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, and G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1980.

Howey, K. & Cannon, B. The school-community council: Process and parity, involvement: A study of shared governance of teacher education. United States Office of Education, 1978.

Hurwitz, E. et. al. Accepting cooperation between school districts and universities: A case study and guidelines. Report for Office of Education (DHEW). Chicago, IL: Midwest Center/Consortium for Planned Change in Pupil Personnel Programs for Urban Schools, 1974 (ERIC ED 124 843).

Kilpatrick, J. Newsmen ask privileges to get at facts. Austin, TX: Austin American Statesman, 1978.

Lake, D. G. & Callahan, D. M. Entering and intervening in schools, In R. A. Schmuck and M. B. Miles (Eds.), Organization development in schools. Palo Alto, CA: National Press Books, 1971.

Lanier, J. Collaboration session, discussant remarks, In G. E. Hall, S. M. Hord, and G. Brown (Eds.), Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research. Austin: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, The University of Texas, 1980.

Levine, S. & White, P. E. Exchange as a conceptual framework for the study of interorganizational relationships. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1961, 5(4), 583-601.

McGrail, J. & Bickel, W. A study of an R&D center/school relationship. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.

Metzner, S. School-university partnership: A tale of dichotomous desires. Phi Delta Kappan, 1970, 51(6), 328-329.

Miller, E. J. & Rice, A. K. Systems of organization: The control of task and sentient boundaries. London: Tavistock, 1967.

Mortensen, R. A. Shared governance. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, 1976 (ERIC ED 128 318).

Murray, S. L. & Smith, N. L. The administrator-researcher interaction: The conduct of cooperative research. Research, Evaluation, Development Paper Series, No. 4. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Office of Research and Evaluation Services, 1974 (ERIC ED 137 911).

New England Program in Teacher Education, Inc. The first five year's activities under public act 761 and public act 230 -- Review and recommendations -- A report. Durham, NH, 1973 (ERIC ED 115 581).

Parson, S. R. Community education and cooperative extension. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(5), 21-22.

Paulson, S. K. Causal analysis of interorganizational relations: An axiomatic theory revised. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1974, 19(3), 319-337.

Rahn, H. W. & Segner, E. P., Jr. Pathways for interaction between academia and industry in technical research. Research Management, 1976, 19(5), 33-36.

Ringers, J., Jr. Community/schools and interagency programs: A guide. Midland, MI: Pendell Publishing Company, 1976 (ERIC ED 135 043).

Schermerhorn, J. R., Jr. Determinants of interorganizational cooperation. Academy of Management Journal, 1975, 18(4), 846-856.

Schwartz, H. When university and schools relate. Educational Leadership, 1973, 30(5), 397-400.

Smith, L. & Longnion, L. A community education cooperative becomes a model for Texas community education. Community Education Journal, 1974, 4(2), 34-36.

Thompson, J. D. Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Title XX and CETA. A Coordination Guide for Title XX Administrators. Report for the Office of Human Development (DHEW), Office of Manpower. San Francisco, CA: Urban Management Consultants of San Francisco, Inc., 1976 (ERIC ED 134 713).

Trist, E. Collaboration in work settings: A personal perspective. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977, 13(3), 268-278.

Van de Ven, A. H. On the nature, formation, and maintenance of relations among organizations. Academy of Management Review, 1976, 1(4), 24-36.

Van Voorhees, C., et. al. Four case studies: Working partnerships between community colleges and community schools. Community Education Monograph #1. Report for Michigan University, Office of Community Education Research. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1977 (ERIC ED 140 874).

Vaughan, L. The oakleaf experience: A long-term partnership between educational research and school practice. Learning Research and Development Center, University of Pittsburgh, 1978 (Prepublication draft).

Walker, E. A. & Hampel, R. G. Role of universities in industrial research: Improving industrial R&D-university relations. Research Management, 1974, 17(5), 23-37.

Ward, B. A. & Tikunoff, W. J. An interactive model of research and development in teaching. San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1976.

Weiss, M. W. No-action to co-action through co-operation: Models of cooperation between community colleges and community schools. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5(1), 17-21, 56.